

that speech I hold dear and use to guide my judgment while serving the citizens of my District and the state of Arizona.

In that speech President Reagan spoke of several principles Republicans, indeed all Americans, continue to hold dear. The first principle is personal freedom. Ronald Reagan quoted James Madison when he stated that the Framers of the Constitution, "base[d] all our experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government." He was correct: Each person should be able to live with the freedom that the Constitution guarantees. Ronald Reagan spent every day in office seeing to it that this principle was advanced and defended.

The second principle that President Reagan advocated was that the government is beholden to the people. Not the reverse. He stated: "This idea that the government was beholden to the people, that it had no other source of power is still the newest, most unique idea in all the long history of man's relation to man."

"This is the issue of this nation: whether we believe in our capacity for self-government or whether we abandon the American Revolution and confess that a little intellectual elite in a far-distant capital can plan our lives better than we can plan them ourselves." Therein lies the essence of President Reagan. Personal choice should not be a right or a gift. Rather, left to their devices, the American people would grow the economy, improve our schools, save for the future and have personal flexibility to achieve those goals. Ronald Reagan showed us the way. We, the American people, proved him right.

During the speech, he also asked: "Are you willing to spend time studying the issues, making yourself aware, and then conveying that information to family and friends?" He continued: "Will you resist the temptation to get a government handout for your community? Realize that the doctor's fight against socialized medicine is your fight. We can't socialize the doctors without socializing the patients. Recognize that government invasion of public power is essentially an assault upon your business. If some of you fear taking a stand because you are afraid of reprisals from customers, clients or even government, recognize that you are just feeding the crocodile hoping he'll eat you last." Truer words have never been spoken, Mr. Speaker. In fact, these words ring true today.

Mr. Reagan extended his vision to a third principle—the economy and the tax code. His belief in lower taxes and private enterprise was based upon the idea that each individual best knows how to spend their money and manage their store. Like the Founding Fathers, President Reagan believed that government control of any enterprise leads to control of the people who run them. How correct he was when he stated:

"The Founding Fathers knew a government can't control the economy without controlling the people. And they knew when a government sets out to do that, it must use force and coercion to achieve that purpose. So we have come to a time for choosing. Public servants say, always with the best of intentions, 'What greater service we could render if only we had a little more money and a little more power.'"

But the truth is that outside of its legitimate function, government does nothing as well or as economically as the private sector."

President Reagan led by those principles. His faith in the individual, belief in free enterprise, and unending conviction in providing freedom of choice in everyday decisions helped to restore the "great, confident roar of American progress, growth and optimism." The "choice" was right then. It is right today. Yet, we must continue to fight for these principles today.

In his farewell address in January of 1989, President Reagan modestly summed up his eight years in office, "All in all, not bad, not bad at all." Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is more fitting of his overall contribution to the American public: "All in all, not bad, not bad at all." Happy Birthday Mr. President. We salute you.

IMPROVING EDUCATION THROUGH THE THREE R'S

HON. SUSAN A. DAVIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2001

Mrs. DAVIS of California. Mr. Speaker, there is widespread agreement that improving education must be our priority in this session of Congress. Fortunately, there is bipartisan agreement about much of the thrust of a program to use our surplus to substantially increase funding for programs that will reach the poorest students.

An important area that we must work on, however, is how to deal with schools where children are not succeeding in learning. As a member of the California Assembly's Education Committee, I worked with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to address this issue. The program which was put in place makes very clear rewards for schools which demonstrate improvement for students at all levels of achievement.

But what happens where a school doesn't improve? This is the important difference. We do not propose using critical funds in the Title I program for low income students to offer a portion of the cost for a child to seek private education. Instead, the failing schools themselves must be changed—through focusing professional development dollars on the principals and teachers or, if necessary replacing the leadership altogether. No school should be allowed to fail.

One of the most critical elements of the New Democrat proposal for the Three R's, therefore, is investment in recruiting, training, and retraining teachers. We must do our best to support our professional educators. Every child has a right to an excellent teacher.

FARMERS NEED A SAFETY NET IN ADDITION TO FLEXIBILITY

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2001

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends to his colleagues the following edi-

torial from the February 2, 2001, Omaha World-Herald. The editorial highlights the challenges in developing a workable agriculture policy which maintains flexibility while providing farmers with assistance when needed.

"FREEDOM" NOT IN FARM LAW

The time is at hand for the U.S. government and the Americans involved in production agriculture to decide how they're going to coexist for the next few years. For farmers, in addition, there is the matter of how to survive in a world in which their product is often available in income-depressing surplus.

Freedom to farm, the tag line given to the 1996 federal farm policy, came along at an inopportune time. The original plan—an end to federal crop subsidies as of next year—turned out to be impractical. Something else is needed.

The underlying philosophy was worth a try. Agriculture was stagnating under the old system, in which farmers received subsidies for planting a specified number of acres to a specified crop. The 1996 idea was to de-link subsidies from planting decisions for a half-dozen years while continuing the flow of cash in the form of transition payments.

This was "freedom to farm." At the end of the transition period, the subsidies would theoretically dry up. Farmers, having tailored their production to maximize their income from the marketplace, would theoretically be ready for financial independence.

Now, with the transition period nearing an end, agriculture's ability to take that next step is more than a little doubtful. It turned out that even a relatively deregulated grain-producing industry couldn't respond in time to take advantage of fast-changing market conditions. As the Asian currency crisis worsened in the late 1990s, American farmers were stuck with huge piles of grain they had produced on the theory that the Pacific Rim boom would be sustained into the new century. From planning to planting to harvest takes many months. When conditions change, it's too late if the crop is in the ground.

The transition payments, instead of descending as planned, have skyrocketed. Since 1996, when the total was \$7 billion, the amount quadrupled. This year's \$28 billion constituted half of all the revenues that farmers received from their operations.

This isn't healthy. But the best idea to come out of a federal panel, created to monitor the outcome of the 1996 approach, is a new variety of subsidy to provide income maintenance for farmers when hit by sagging market demand for their products.

Subsidies have a downside. They keep inefficient operations from being squeezed out by efficient competitors. This creates a self-fulfilling cycle. Inefficiency intensifies the demand for subsidies, leading to more inefficiency.

Subsidies, in addition, sometimes undermine the political support for agriculture in parts of the country where the Midwestern corn-wheat-cattle-hogs economy is not well understood. Eastern commentators include farms among the recipients of corporate welfare. They seem to forget that subsidies have been part of a cheap-food policy under which Americans pay a lower percentage of their income for food than is possible in nearly any other part of the world.

So the aid the government has given to agriculture is not necessarily bad. Indeed, former Secretary of Agriculture Dan Glickman said the alternative would have been chaos in rural America last year. And the